

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are now pending in this application. The Office Action mailed July 14, 2005 rejected claims 1-46. No Claims have been amended, added, or deleted in this response. No new matter has been added. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicants submits that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-46 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nolting et al. (US 6,744,866), in view of Relyea et al. (US 5,930,344). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Nowhere, for example, do the cited references describe a mechanism whereby the subscriber selects the electronic delivery mechanism, and electronically transmitting the formatted call transaction data using the subscriber selected electronic delivery mechanism. See Applicants' independent Claims 1, 12, 30-32, 44, and 46.

The Office Action identifies several sections within Nolting; however, none of the cited sections describe the subscriber selecting the delivery mechanism. Instead, the identified sections merely identify that data is compiled into reports for output to a user's terminal (Nolting, Col. 7, lines 23-31); that records may be transported by physical data tapes, or by an appropriate data link (Nolting, Col. 14, lines 20-35); that a multi-dimensional database (MDDb) processes data to generate analytical tables, reports, and graphs (Nolting, Col. 17, lines 14-23); and that reports are written to a disk file in text form, with a second report generated using a comma separated list suitable for importing into most spread sheets, and further that data will be written in HTML format (Nolting, Col 24, lines 62-67). However, nowhere does Nolting disclose or even suggest that the mechanism for electronic delivery is selected by the subscriber. In fact, it appears that Nolting produces multiple files, independent of whether the subscriber asks for them or not. Because

independent claims 1, 12, 30-32, 44, and 46 each enable the subscriber to select an electronic delivery mechanism, for at least this reason, the cited references do not make the claimed invention obvious. Therefore, independent claims 1, 12, 30-32, 44, and 46 should be allowed to issue.

Moreover, Claim 32 further recites a method that includes, among other things, determining an approximate longitude and latitude of the second caller for each call using the call transaction data. Nolting merely suggests that three area code digits (NPA) and NXX digits of an NXX-XXXX (seven-digit) telephone number can server as identifiers of end offices. See Nolting, Col. 8, lines 29-40. Nolting does disclose a user interface that may identify a study area, which provides a geographic area that an analysis covers (i.e., Vermont); but again, this does not recite the claim limitation of claim 32. Neither a general reference to a study area, nor a reference to telephone numbers, suggests or discloses the limitations of Claim 32. Thus, for at least this reason Claim 32 is not anticipated by, nor made obvious by Nolting. Therefore, Claim 32 should be allowed to issue.

In regard to Claims 2-11, 13-29, 33-43, and 45 which are dependent on amended independent Claims 1, 12, 32, and 44 respectively, they are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above for those independent claims.

CONCLUSION

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed in the Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: September 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By *J. Wiegand*
Jamie L. Wiegand
Registration No.: 52,361
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(206) 262-8900
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Customer No.: 07278